



# Report on the part of the final state examination Record of the thesis defence

Academic year: 2023/2024

**Student's name and surname:** Yuki Takenaka  
**Student's ID:** 96848359

**Type of the study programme:** Master's (post-Bachelor)  
**Study programme:** Media and Area studies  
**Study ID:** 757688

**Title of the thesis:** Culture of Commemoration: Unraveling Official and Unofficial Memories of Hiroshima in Contemporary Japan  
**Thesis department:** Department of Media Studies (23-KMS)  
**Language of the thesis:** English  
**Language of defence:** English  
**Advisor:** doc. Maria Alina Asavei, D.Phil.  
**Reviewer(s):** Barbara Ravbar, M.A.  
**Date of defence:** 18.09.2024    **Venue of defence:** Praha  
**Attempt:** regular

**Course of the examination:** Yuki Takenaka defended her thesis “Culture of Commemoration: Unraveling Official and Unofficial Memories of Hiroshima in Contemporary Japan“  
First she introduced her thesis topic and its importance, locating it in the paradigm memory studies. She explained her choice of theories, methods, and execution of her analysis. She highlighted the concept of victimhood as a central notion in her results.  
The committee then presented the supervisor’s review, suggesting the evaluation between B and C. She focused on uncritical work with literature and second research question not being properly answered, otherwise the thesis should be sound. She posed questions about “grey zones” between Japanese official and vernacular discourse, confusing term “generalized data”, specifics of Japanese language about cultural memory, and about Japan being both victim and the perpetrator.  
The opponent then presented her review, suggesting the evaluation of “B”. She noted that choice of discourse analysis is not properly explained. She asks about possible use of quantitative approach for the same research, choice of film reviews, and on extracting the sample.  
Both the supervisor and the opponent had issues with quoting and paraphrasing.  
The student then discussed the issues raised by the reviewers and the questions posed by the committee, including the quoting and paraphrasing and collection of the data.  
Based on the thesis, the reviews and the defense, the committee decided to evaluate the thesis with the grade B.

<b>Result of defence:</b>	excellent (B)	
<b>Chair of the board:</b>	Jiráček Jan, prof. PhDr., Ph.D. (present)	.....
<b>Committee members:</b>	Štoll Martin, prof. MgA., Ph.D. (present)	.....
	Nečas Vlastimil, PhDr., Ph.D. (present)	.....